



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/576,175	04/19/2006	Graeme Bilbe	33440-US-PCT	7229
1095 7590 03/25/2008				
NOVARTIS				
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY				
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3				
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080				
EXAMINER				
JAVANMARD, SAHAR				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/576,175

Applicant(s)

BILBE, GRAEME

Examiner

SAHAR JAVANMARD

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/19/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Restriction Requirement remarks filed on February 4, 2008. Claim(s) 1-8 are pending. Claim(s) 9-10 have been cancelled. Applicant's election of Group I drawn to claims 1-8 drawn to methods for the treatment and/or prevention of neurological and vascular disorders related to beta-amyloid generation and/or aggregation comprising administering an inhibitor and a species election of compound 4-Methyl-N-[3-(4-methyl-imidazol-1-yl)-5-trifluoromethyl-phenyl]-3-(4-pyridin-3-yl-pyrimidin-2-ylamino)-benzamide without traverse of the restriction requirement in the reply is acknowledged. The requirement is deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. Claim(s) 1-8 are examined herein insofar as they read on the elected invention and species.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for scope of enablement because the specification, while being enabling for the treatment of neurological and vascular disorders related to beta-amyloid generation and/or

Art Unit: 1617

aggregation, does not reasonably provide enablement for the prevention of neurological and vascular disorders related to beta-amyloid generation and/or aggregation as recited in these claims.

The instant claims are drawn to a method for the prevention of neurological and vascular disorders related to beta-amyloid generation and/or aggregation. The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApl's 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

(1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

Nature of the invention:

The instant invention pertains to a method for the prevention of neurological and vascular disorders related to beta-amyloid generation and/or aggregation.

The state of the prior art:

The skilled artisan would view that the prevention of one or more symptoms of neurological and vascular disorders related to beta-amyloid generation and/or

Art Unit: 1617

aggregation totally, absolutely, or permanently, is highly unlikely, since one cannot guarantee that neurological and vascular disorders will always be prevented.

The relative skill of those in the art:

The relative skill of those in the art is very high.

The predictability or lack thereof in the art:

The skilled artisan would view that the treatment to prevent neurological and vascular disorders related to beta-amyloid generation and/or aggregation, absolutely, or permanently is highly unpredictable.

The amount of direction or guidance presented and the presence or absence of working examples:

In the instant case, no working examples are presented in the specification as filed showing how to prevent neurological and vascular disorders related to beta-amyloid generation and/or aggregation totally, absolutely, or permanently. Note that lack of a working example, is a critical factor to be considered, especially in a case involving an unpredictable and undeveloped art. See MPEP 2164.

Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk, 108 F.3d at 1366, states that "a patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search, but compensation for its successful conclusion" and "[p]atent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable".

Therefore, in view of the *Wands* factors, e.g., the amount of direction or guidance provided, absence of working examples, and the predictability of the art discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test the combination in the instant claims whether preventing neurological and vascular disorders related to beta-amyloid generation and/or aggregation totally, absolutely, or permanently.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Netzer et al. (WO 03/057165 A2).

Netzer teaches methods and compositions for treating amyloid- β -related disorder such as Alzheimer's disease via administration of compounds that modulate, e.g. inhibit, ATP-dependent enzymatic activity such as γ -secretase activity (page 3, lines 28-31). In an embodiment, the enzyme activity is a kinase activity. The compound binds a kinase enzyme exhibiting an ATP-dependent enzymatic activity. In a specific

Art Unit: 1617

embodiment the kinase is a tyrosine kinase namely, Abl kinase, BCR-Abl kinase, ARG kinase, src kinase, c-kit, platelet-derived growth factor receptor (PDGFR) (page 43, lines 4-11; claims 1, 33, 37, 38, 102, 103), meeting the limitations of claims 1 and 6-7.

Netzer teaches that a treatment regimen can be administered to an elderly person, e.g., age 65 or older. The composition is administered daily with doses ranging from 10 μ g/day to a maximum of 800 μ g/day (page 64, lines 10-20), meeting the limitations of claim 5.

Conclusion

Claims 1-8 are not allowed.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sahar Javanmard whose telephone number is (571) 270-3280. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM-5 PM MON-FRI (EST).

Art Unit: 1617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/S. J./

Examiner, Art Unit 1617

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617